



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

JJGJR.: 06-06

Paper No: \_\_

TECHNOLOGY, PATENTS  
AND LICENSING, INC.  
2003 SOUTH EASTON ROAD  
SUITE 208  
DOYLESTOWN PA 18901

**COPY MAILED**

JUN 19 2006

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Hall, et al. :  
Application No. 09/867,416 :  
Filed: 31 May, 2001 :  
Attorney Docket No. P270569 :

ON PETITION

This is a decision on a petition filed on 3 May, 2006, under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

For the reasons set forth below, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **DISMISSED**.

**NOTES:**

- (1) Any petition (and fee) for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within two (2) months from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)."
- (2) Thereafter, there will be no further reconsideration of this matter.

**Further:**

**Petitioner does not appear to have been Counsel of Record at the time the instant**

**application went abandoned, and, therefore, cannot attest to the nature of the abandonment, whether unintentional or otherwise.**

**BACKGROUND**

The record indicates:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the Restriction Requirement mailed on 26 September, 2005, with reply due absent extension of time on or before Tuesday, 27 December, 2005;
- the instant application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 26 December, 2005;
- the Office mailed a Notice of Abandonment on 5 April 2006;
- Petitioner filed the instant petition on 3 May, 2006, *without* fee/authorization, and, *inter alia*, reply in the form of an election amendment—however, because Petitioner was not of record at the time the application went abandoned, Petitioner is not in a position to make such a statement as to the nature of the delay, and must obtain the statement of former Counsel (of record at the time of abandonment) and/or of Applicant(s);
- Petitioners always are reminded of the burden of those registered to practice *and* all others who make representations before the Office, *inter alia*, to inquire into the underlying facts of representations made to the Office.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See supplement of 17 June, 1999. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting a statement made by Petitioner. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing statements to the Patent and Trademark Office).

Specifically, the regulations at 37 C.F.R. §10.18 provide:

**§ 10.18 Signature and certificate for correspondence filed in the Patent and Trademark Office.**

- (a) For all documents filed in the Office in patent, trademark, and other non-patent matters, except for correspondence that is required to be signed by the applicant or party, each piece of correspondence filed by a practitioner in the Patent and Trademark Office must bear a signature by such practitioner complying with the provisions of §1.4(d), §1.4(e), or § 2.193(c)(1) of this chapter.
- (b) By presenting to the Office (whether by signing, filing, submitting, or later advocating) any paper, the party presenting such paper, whether a practitioner or non-practitioner, is certifying that—

(1) All statements made therein of the party's own knowledge are true, all statements made therein on information and belief are believed to be true, and all statements made therein are made with the knowledge that whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the Patent and Trademark Office, knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be subject to the penalties set forth under 18 U.S.C. 1001, and that violations of this paragraph may jeopardize the validity of the application or document, or the validity or enforceability of any patent, trademark registration, or certificate resulting therefrom; and

(2) To the best of the party's knowledge, information and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances, that —

(i) The paper is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass someone or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of prosecution before the Office;

## STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).<sup>2</sup>

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.<sup>3</sup>

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.<sup>4</sup> Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).<sup>5</sup>

- 
- (ii) The claims and other legal contentions therein are warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law;
- (iii) The allegations and other factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and
- (iv) The denials of factual contentions are warranted on the evidence, or if specifically so identified, are reasonably based on a lack of information or belief.
- (c) Violations of paragraph (b)(1) of this section by a practitioner or non-practitioner may jeopardize the validity of the application or document, or the validity or enforceability of any patent, trademark registration, or certificate resulting therefrom. Violations of any of paragraphs (b)(2)(i) through (iv) of this section are, after notice and reasonable opportunity to respond, subject to such sanctions as deemed appropriate by the Commissioner, or the Commissioner's designee, which may include, but are not limited to, any combination of —
- (1) Holding certain facts to have been established;
  - (2) Returning papers;
  - (3) Precluding a party from filing a paper, or presenting or contesting an issue;
  - (4) Imposing a monetary sanction;
  - (5) Requiring a terminal disclaimer for the period of the delay; or
  - (6) Terminating the proceedings in the Patent and Trademark Office.
- (d) Any practitioner violating the provisions of this section may also be subject to disciplinary action. See § 10.23(c)(15).
- [Added 50 FR 5175, Feb. 6, 1985, effective Mar. 8, 1985; para. (a) revised, 58 FR 54494, Oct. 22, 1993, effective Nov. 22, 1993; paras. (a) & (b) revised, paras. (c) & (d) added, 62 FR 53131, Oct. 10, 1997, effective Dec. 1, 1997; para. (a) revised, 69 FR 56481, Sept. 21, 2004, effective Oct. 21, 2004]

<sup>2</sup> 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

**35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.**

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

<sup>3</sup> Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

<sup>4</sup> See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

<sup>5</sup> See: *In re Application of G.*, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.<sup>6</sup> Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.<sup>7</sup>)

Allegations as to  
Unintentional Delay

The requirements for relief under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are: petition, fee, reply, showing of unintentional delay, and—where appropriate—a terminal disclaimer and fee

It appears that Petitioner has not satisfied the “fee” and “statement/showing” requirements of the regulation.

CONCLUSION

The petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is dismissed.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:<sup>8</sup>

By mail:      Commissioner for Patents<sup>9</sup>  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX:      IFW Formal Filings  
(571) 273-8300  
ATTN.: Office of Petitions

---

<sup>6</sup> See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra.

<sup>7</sup> Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

<sup>8</sup> On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number changed to (571) 273-8300. The number (571) 273-8300 is to be the only facsimile number recognized for centralized delivery. (For further information, see: <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/ola/preognote/cfax062005.pdf>.)

<sup>9</sup> To determine the appropriate addresses for other subject-specific correspondence, refer to the USPTO Web site at [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov).

By hand:      Mail Stop: Petition  
                  Customer Service Window  
                  Randolph Building  
                  401 Dulany Street  
                  Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.



John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions